

**GRADUATE COUNCIL  
AGENDA  
Friday, June 2, 2006  
10:00 – 12:00 noon  
912 Sproul Hall**

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>ATTACHMENT</b>
<b><u>ACTION ITEMS</u></b>	
<b>Biomedical Engineering – PRC Report</b> (Guest Dallas Hyde)	10.1
<b>Entomology – PRC Report</b> (Guest Valerie Williamson)	10.2
<b>DE in African American and African Studies – Proposal to establish a new DE</b> (de la Peña)	10.3
<b>Biological Systems Engineering Integrated BS/MS Program – Proposal and Addendum</b> (de la Peña)	10.4
<b>PRC Report Transmittal Letters – Drafts</b>	
• <b>Chemical Engineering</b> (Waterhouse)	10.5
• <b>Cultural Studies</b> (Waterhouse)	10.6
• <b>Viticulture and Enology</b> (de la Peña)	10.7
<b>Applied Science Engineering Degree Requirement Changes – Additional revisions</b> (de la Peña) <i>Also, please bring Attachment 9.8 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.</i>	10.8
<b>CCGA – Recommendation of the Competitive graduate Student Financial Support Committee</b> (Waterhouse) <i>Attachment 9.* from the May 25, 2006 meeting.</i>	Addendum
<b><u>CONSENT ITEMS</u></b>	
<b>Minutes from March 17, 2006 meeting – Draft</b>	10.9
<b>Cultural Studies – Degree requirement changes</b> (de la Peña)	10.10
<b><u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u></b> [All discussion items were carried over.]	
<b>Report on the School of Public Health Committee</b> (Mueller)	
<b>APD Recommendations</b> (Baumgarth) <i>Please bring Attachments 9.10 and 9.11 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.</i>	
<b>Survey and Database of Key Recurring Impediments to Graduate Education</b>	
<b>Core Course Development and Self Review</b>	
<b>Essential Features of the Doctoral Qualifying Examination</b> (Waterhouse)	Revised 9.4
<b>Master’s Thesis Definition</b> (Waterhouse) <i>Please bring Attachment 8.12 from the April 21, 2006 meeting.</i>	
<b>Designated Emphases – Affiliated with grant proposals</b> (Waterhouse)	
<b>Adjunct faculty proposers</b> (Leal)	
<b><u>SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS</u></b> [There was just one subcommittee announcement.]	
Program Review (Mechling)	
<b><u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u></b> [There were no further announcements.]	

Andrew Waterhouse, Chair

**MINUTES**  
**GRADUATE COUNCIL**  
**June 2, 2006**

**PRESENT:** *Members:* N. Baumgarth, A. Britt, J. Cadden, C. de la Peña, T. Kuhl, W. Leal, J. Mechling, H. Mueller, S. Upadhyaya, A. Waterhouse, E. Watkins, R. Wu  
*Representatives:* E. Caswell-Chen, C. Hom, J. Karpel, A. Kelleher, S. O'Neill, A. Sheets  
*Graduate Studies attendees:* K. Garcia, C. Jurado, L. Wilce

**GUESTS:** Thomas Aguilar (GSA Chair 2006-2007), Dallas Hyde, Valerie Williamson

**ABSENT:** *Members:* J. Gibeling, M. Farrens  
*Representatives:* C. Bates, J. Breslin

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Entomology – PRC Report**

PRC Chair Jay Mechling noted that PRC does not yet have the correction of fact from the program. If Council votes today to approve the report, the approval should be conditional on the program's correction of fact not being substantial. Otherwise, the report would need to be returned to Council. Professor Mechling introduced Professor Valerie Williamson, the PRC liaison for the Entomology review. She reported that Entomology is a strong research program and is known as one of the best Entomology programs in the nation. The report says its students are outstanding, student financial support is excellent, and the faculty members are recognized nationally and internationally for their high quality research.

Entomology's primary problems are related to the curriculum, student advising, and the need for a new department chair. The first recommendation is to establish a Curriculum Committee. Professor Williamson described the problems that this committee could address. There is no stated program and no core courses, just remedial courses and electives. When the students arrive, they meet with an academic adviser, and then a guidance committee, which includes the student's major professor and two other faculty members. There is a departmental exam at the beginning of the second year and there is a study guide for the exam. The students want a core course fall quarter of their first year to introduce them to the program and each other. Students are supposed to form study groups to study for the departmental exam but are not given the study guide until late in the spring quarter. Students also are supposed to initiate and organize participatory seminar courses, as well as recruit faculty to offer them. Faculty members often do not agree to participate and the quality of the seminars is highly variable. Students have difficulty finding out what courses are offered. Because students have low priority access to the Web site person, they have been unable to correct this.

The second recommendation is to establish an Education Policy Committee to address student advising problems. There is a lack of consistency in advising and guidance, for example in determining course deficiencies. There are three advisers whose advice is highly variable and there is a lack of consistency across guidance committees. The committee, which would include advisers and students, could develop a list of consistent recommendations for remedial courses.

The third recommendation was for Entomology to consider promoting its M.S. program. Currently, there are just two M.S. students. Professor Williamson reported that the extension

faculty members think that the state needs M.S. students. The admissions committee says master's students are not applying, but the Web site does not encourage them to apply. The program could poll commodity stakeholders about the need for graduates with the M.S. degree.

Council strongly supported Recommendation 4. to select a new chair, especially a chair who is dedicated to graduate education, or to have the new chair appoint a dedicated faculty member to manage the graduate program. The last three recommendations were for more TAs, a new hire in Molecular Biology of Insects, and the elimination of out-of-state fees for graduate students.

Council discussed the program's strengths, its excellence in research, good financial support packages for its students, and its steady enrollment level despite having few international students. Chair Andrew Waterhouse thought that many of the program's problems might be due to the difficulty of recruiting a department chair. Council discussed the report's recommendations and thought that the students ought to receive the study guide for the departmental exam as soon as they arrive on campus, that the departmental exam ought to be given at the end of the first year instead of in the following fall, and that the graduate program ought to name a master adviser.

The PRC Chair suggested that Council request a status report from the program two years after the October 31, 2006 date when the initial responses to the recommendations will be due. He also thought the program should be warned that Council would consider initiating the next full program review earlier than usual. Committee Analyst Kathy Garcia noted that the Program Review Closure Committee could make a recommendation to Council regarding an earlier review after the status report is received.

Associate Dean Caswell-Chen thought that the transmittal letter should highlight the recommendation for Entomology to consider promoting the master's program. Because admissions to the Integrated Pest Management program were suspended earlier this year, that M.S. is no longer available and there may be an unmet need in the state for master's level graduates. Professor Williamson noted that approximately half of the faculty members do not have graduate students. These members are more applied in their orientation and might like to have more master's students. Chair Waterhouse thanked Professor Williamson for her work on the program review and for presenting the PRC report to Council.

Professor Joan Cadden made the motion to approve the PRC report, contingent on the program's correction of fact being minor. The motion was seconded. Nine members voted in favor, none were opposed, and one member in the graduate program abstained. Chair Waterhouse will draft the transmittal letter and bring it to Council's next meeting for review and approval.

### **DE in African American and African Studies – Proposal to establish a new DE**

EPC Chair de la Peña presented the proposal to establish a new Designated Emphasis in African American and African Studies (DEAAS). Her letter described the history of EPC's review of the proposal. Although the faculty members of the African American and African Studies program have not had their own graduate program, they have had graduate students from other programs working with them on independent studies. Professor de la Peña pointed out the support letters for the DE from the Dean of HARCS, the chairs of the affiliated Ph.D. programs, the Director of Women and Gender Studies, and the participating faculty. She also described the DE's curriculum and requirements. The DE is very well supported by faculty members on campus.

Professor Evan Watkins made the motion to approve the DE in African American and African Studies. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will notify Dean Gibeling and CCGA in writing of Council's approval. No further approval is required. The proposers request that admissions to the DE be opened beginning Fall 2007. The DE's bylaws are currently under review by the Bylaws Committee.

### **Biological Systems Engineering Integrated BS/MS Program – Proposal**

EPC Chair de la Peña presented the proposal for the integrated BS/MS program in Biological Systems Engineering and Dean Gibeling's request for an additional clarification. Many BSE students are interested in this integrated program. Professor de la Peña pointed out the engineering program precedents on campus for the BSE integrated BS/MS program. She reported that the group of proposers for this program has been highly responsive to making modifications to their proposal in order to address EPC's requests for clarification. They are proposing a Plan I and a Plan II master's. There would be different requirements for the two plans: 30 units for Plan I and 36 units for Plan II. The distinction between the integrated program MS and the separate MS program is that the student would save 3 units. The integrated program MS Plan I students are required to complete 30 units as opposed to 36 units in the regular MS program, but that integrated MS student would have completed 3 graduate units as an undergraduate senior. Rather than taking the seminar that seniors take, the students would take a 3 unit graduate course.

Chair Waterhouse reported that quite a few engineering schools are offering this type of degree program. Professor de la Peña indicated that EPC understood that the integrated program was one way for our campus BSE program to be competitive with other programs. A Council member asked whether there were any arguments against the integrated program. A graduate student thought that very few students actually completed integrated programs in five years, primarily because they do not complete the BS portion in four years. Council discussed time to degree for both bachelor's and master's degrees.

One member thought that from Council's perspective, just considering the graduate portion of the integrated degree program, the question is whether the additional MS degree can realistically be completed in one year. The member thought that it would be better for the program to state not that it is a five year program, but that it is a program that will give the student the MS degree in one additional year beyond the BS degree.

Professor de la Peña made the motion to approve the proposed program, contingent on the proposers agreeing to add another sentence with the clarification that although normative time is 5 years, the MS is a one year program to be added after the bachelor's program. The motion was seconded and there was no further discussion. Ten members voted in favor, none were opposed and one member in the graduate program abstained.

### **Chemical Engineering PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter**

Chair Waterhouse pointed out that the draft transmittal letter highlighted two concerns. The first was the accelerated or very rapid timing of the QE and the discrepancy of enforcing the requirement between international and domestic students. The second concern was the intensity of the core courses in the fall quarter of the first year. Ms. Garcia asked that Archie Johnson's name be added to the letter. The reviewers felt strongly regarding the graduate staff person's role in and work for the program and they made a point of recognizing her by name in the ad hoc committee report. Professor Cadden made the motion to approve the letter with the addition of Ms. Johnson's

name. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will send the letter and PRC report to the addressees.

### **Cultural Studies PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter**

Chair Waterhouse reminded Council of its May meeting discussion regarding the graduate group's need for support. The letter expresses Council's concern regarding this issue and says it needs attention. Also, he pointed out that he has added the Dean of Social Sciences to the list of addressees because there is a substantial number of faculty members from that division who are members of the Cultural Studies graduate group. One member requested clarification of the statement made at the last meeting that HARCS faculty would not be in a graduate program if it were not for this graduate group. Another member reported that the majority of the faculty members who contribute to Cultural Studies, from the executive committee to the people who teach the courses, do not have another graduate program available and Cultural Studies is the only program where they can have graduate students.

A Council member thought that one paragraph in the transmittal letter needed to be moved and a sentence should be added to it to clarify the concern expressed. Council agreed that it needed to be re-worded. Chair Waterhouse will rework the letter and bring it back to the next meeting.

### **Biomedical Engineering – PRC Report**

PRC Chair Mechling introduced Professor Dallas Hyde, the PRC liaison for the review of Biomedical Engineering. Professor Hyde presented the PRC report. The program's strengths are presented in the PRC report and include its research record, national and international recognition of faculty quality, active participation in an MRU and hosting the inaugural symposium, its leadership (chair and executive committee), student support, national ranking, quality of students, the breadth of faculty participation from across campus, and an interdisciplinary curriculum.

Professor Hyde presented the PRC report's recommendations for improvement of the program. The Executive Committee needs to establish a separate Curriculum Committee to address the core and elective track curricula. The core courses should be reviewed for relevance and focus. Course content should be clear to faculty and students. Core course scheduling should be when students are available and not conflict with elective courses, and classroom size should be appropriate. The lack of consistency and varying difficulty in the written preliminary exam from year to year should be addressed. Information on elective courses for all the tracks should be created and made available to the students and faculty advisers; this was particularly needed for the Musculoskeletal Biomechanics track.

Professor Hyde reported that less than half the faculty responded to the confidential questionnaire but the review committee received much faculty input via e-mail or one-on-one conversations. Council discussed weakness #5 and recommendation #5 at length and requested clarification of whether the problem was the presence of students other than the student representatives at the annual meeting or whether the problem was the lack of frank communication between the faculty from the Department of Biomedical Engineering and the faculty from outside the department. The faculty needs to discuss the core courses and curriculum issues. The PRC Chair and committee analyst will find out what the problem(s) are.

Recommendation 6 was for the careful review of financial capacities before admitting students. Professor Hyde noted that the graduate group admits more students than they can fund in the Musculoskeletal Biomechanics track. Chair Waterhouse requested elaboration on this track

because many of the problems appear to be related to discrepancies between the Musculoskeletal Biomechanics (MB) track, which has been the graduate group's traditional strength, and the Biomedical Imaging (BI) and Cellular & Molecular Systems (CMS) tracks in the Department of Biomedical Engineering. Professor Hyde explained that the Department of Biomedical Engineering has "taken off" since being established in 2001, with the winning of the Whitaker Foundation Leadership/Development Award. Because the graduate program is a graduate group, it has not benefited across the board from the department. The reviewers thought that the graduate group structure should be retained and could offer a broader program than the more narrowly focused department could offer on its own. However, the department has more resources than the graduate group and therefore, the tracks within the department (BI and CMS) benefit more. The reports recommend that the department reach out to the Musculoskeletal Biomechanics track. Bridges need to be built between the two groups of faculty. Faculty with expertise in tissue engineering and skeletal muscle imaging might begin to bridge the gap.

Of the eleven other recommendations, Council thought three more should be highlighted. These include the lower salaries for GSRs in the MB track compared with the BI and CMS tracks, the lack of underrepresented minority students in the program, and the need to have a full-time instead of half-time administrative support staff person for the group. Regarding the GSR salaries, Associate Dean Caswell-Chen will check on the Biomedical Engineering Graduate Group's compensation plan that is on file. Council was also concerned about the program's time to degree (TTD) although it understood that the students needed to have or obtain background in both the biomedical and engineering areas in order to be successful in this degree program. Professor Hyde thought that TTD could be improved by having and enforcing more definitive guidelines regarding the timing of the preliminary examination and Qualifying Examination.

Professor de la Peña made the motion to accept the PRC report with the modification of Weakness and Recommendation #5 to remove any ambiguity that students were the problem and to reflect Council's discussion. Associate Dean Caswell-Chen will check the group's compensation plan. Professor de la Peña's question was whether there was a factual error in #5. Professor Mechling thought that there might be two problems, the presence of other students at the annual meeting and the faculty's inability to talk to each other, which are not mutually exclusive. Chair Waterhouse tabled the PRC report to the next meeting when PRC could come back with comments and an amendment to the PRC report if it is needed.

### **Viticulture and Enology PRC Report – Draft transmittal letter**

Vice Chair de la Peña presented the draft transmittal letter. Ms. Garcia asked Council to add the graduate program staff person's name in the letter. Ms. Judy Blevins was mentioned by name in the committee's reports in recognition of her contributions to the graduate group. Professor Cadden made the motion to approve the letter. The motion was seconded and 11 members voted in favor of the motion, none were opposed, and there was one abstention from a member of the graduate group. The motion was carried. The Vice Chair will mail the letter and PRC report to the addressees.

### **Applied Science Engineering Degree Requirement Changes – Additional revisions**

*Attachment 9.8 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.*

Dean Gibeling moved the Applied Science Engineering degree requirements off the consent list at the last meeting because he noticed some errors that needed to be corrected. EPC Chair de la Peña contacted Professor Ann Orel, the program chair, who has made the necessary corrections. There were two specific comments. One was that they needed to state that the QE was taken after the

completion of all the required course work rather than after the completion of 24 units. The other was that they needed to say “disqualified” rather than “dismissed” under Section 12. There were also two misspellings to be corrected. Professor Cadden made the motion to approve the additional changes and the revised degree requirements. The motion was seconded and the vote in favor was unanimous. Chair Waterhouse will notify the program chair of the approval.

### **CONSENT ITEMS**

#### **Minutes from March 17, 2006 meeting – Draft**

The minutes were approved as presented and will be posted on the Web.

#### **Cultural Studies – Degree requirement changes**

EPC Chair de la Peña pointed out that Council approved the Cultural Studies PRC report at its last meeting. Because the one very clear change recommended to the curriculum was to decrease the colloquium requirement from 9 units to 6 units, EPC asked Cultural Studies whether it wished to make that change as part of the current revised degree requirements. The Cultural Studies Executive Committee has approved that change and it will be included in the revised degree requirements.

Professor Upadhyaya pointed out some wording that may need to be clarified. Under 2.c. Unit Requirements, Cultural Studies says, “A maximum of 12 of the 30 units may be in upper division courses.” Typically, the requirement is a minimum of 12 of the 30 units should be graduate units. He wondered whether they were putting some restrictions on the number of undergraduate units. Chair Waterhouse interpreted this as a restriction of the number of undergraduate units that can be applied toward the degree. Lower division units cannot be used in graduate programs so this is effectively saying that out of the 30 units of the coursework, students can only take 12 of those units as undergraduate upper division courses. The member asked what the next sentence meant: “This does not include the Cultural Studies Colloquium, CST 290, or Research, CST 299.” Professor de la Peña explained that the next sentence is building on the 30 units, a maximum of 12 of the 30 units, may be in upper division courses. She thought that the 30 units did not include the Cultural Studies Colloquium or independent research units. The member said that the program never states the 12 unit requirement of graduate courses. Another member asked whether students were required to take those 30 units plus the colloquium and independent study units. Professor de la Peña responded that she would verify what the graduate group meant and would request a clarification of the wording. The revised degree requirements with the decrease in colloquium units from 9 to 6 were approved as a consent item with an amendment. Chair Waterhouse will notify the program chair of the approval.

#### **CCGA – Recommendation of the Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee**

Chair Waterhouse presented CCGA’s request for endorsement of the recommendations of the report of the Competitive Graduate Student Financial Support Advisory Committee. At the last meeting Council discussed the recommendations at length and that discussion is summarized in the addendum. Chair Waterhouse noted that some members had some concerns about endorsing the recommendations because funds had been directed from other sources into the NRT and that would somehow injure graduate education. His thoughts were that the faculty has already passed the NRT memorial to the Regents. This report is essentially asking the Regents to address the memorial but it also adds some other issues. This is a large amount of money that is going to have an effect on graduate student funding one way or another. Two issues came up at the last meeting. One was that this major redirection of funding could have unintended consequences on other

aspects of graduate education. The other issue was that the memorial focused on terminal academic degrees and this report focuses just on Ph.D.s. A member said that over the last 5-6 years, the one thing that everyone has been asking for has been the elimination of NRT and finally this committee appointed by the Office of the President has looked at the recommendation seriously and is trying to come up with a solution to the problem. Endorsing the report is really just endorsing Council's previous recommendation that NRT should be eliminated. The report is asking for elimination of the NRT for second year students starting next academic year and for everybody after that if possible.

Professor Nicole Baumgarth made the motion to endorse the report with the change from just Ph.D. students to all terminal academic degree students. The motion was seconded. The vote in favor was 8, none were opposed, and none abstained. Chair Waterhouse will write a letter with Council's endorsement before CCGA's next meeting on June 6, 2006.

### **ANNOUNCEMENT**

Ms. Garcia announced that at Council's next meeting, there would be two full PRC reports for Epidemiology and Ecology, as well as a brief letter to Council from Professor Mechling about the Master of Laws review.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

The discussion items were carried over due to lack of time.

**Report on the School of Public Health Committee** (Mueller)

**APD Recommendations** *Attachments 9.10 and 9.11 from the May 25, 2006 meeting.*

(Baumgarth)

**Survey and Database of Key Recurring Impediments to Graduate Education**

**Core Course Development and Self Review**

**Essential Features of the Doctoral Qualifying Examination – Revised** (Waterhouse)

**Master's Thesis Definition** *Attachment 8.12 from the April 21, 2006 meeting.* (Waterhouse)

**Designated Emphases – Affiliated with grant proposals** (Waterhouse)

**Adjunct faculty proposers** (Leal)

There were no subcommittee reports or further announcements due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

OGS – lsw